UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/512,007	08/25/2005	Udo Suffa	24458PCT/US	2288
20311 LUCAS & MEI	7590 11/13/200 RCANTI. LLP	EXAMINER		
475 PARK AV	*	BAINBRIDGE, ANDREW PHILIP		
15TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10016			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
·			3754	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		pplication No.	Applicant(s)
		0/512,007	SUFFA, UDO
		kaminer	Art Unit
	1	NDREW P. BAINBRIDGE	3754
The MAILING DATE of this con Period for Reply	nmunication appear	s on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE Extensions of time may be available under the proafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this If NO period for reply is specified above, the maxin Failure to reply within the set or extended period for Any reply received by the Office later than three mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.70	HE MAILING DATE visions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) is communication. num statutory period will aper reply will, by statute, causenths after the mailing date	E OF THIS COMMUNICATION. In no event, however, may a reply be to oply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
 Responsive to communication(section) This action is FINAL. Since this application is in conclused in accordance with the process. 	2b)⊠ This act ition for allowance	tion is non-final. except for formal matters, pi	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 35-69 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) 52-58 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 35-51,59,61 and 67-69 7) Claim(s) is/are objected 8) Claim(s) 35-69 are subject to respect to the specification is objected to 10) The drawing(s) filed on is	2.60,62-66 is/are wing is/are rejected. to. Estriction and/or electory the Examiner.	ection requirement.	Evaminar
Applicant may not request that any Replacement drawing sheet(s) incl	objection to the draw	wing(s) be held in abeyance. So is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
	of: ority documents ha ority documents ha pies of the priority on national Bureau (P	ave been received. ave been received in Applica documents have been receiv CT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Rev 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/24/2006.		4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date

Art Unit: 3754

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- Applicant's election without traverse of Species A of Figure 1, claims 35-51, 59,
 and 67-69 in the reply filed on 6/11/2008 is acknowledged.
- 2. Claims 52-58, 60, and 62-66 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 6/11/2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 39 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
 - a. Claim 39, the phrase "of convex shape throughout as far as the peripheral region" is ambiguous of the scope of the convex area, and renders the claim indefinite. Appropriate correction is required.
 - b. Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d

Art Unit: 3754

1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The term "directed away" and "directed toward" in claim 43 is used by the claim to mean "the closer leg to the product", while the accepted meaning is "the leg is projecting toward." The term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 35-48 and 67-69 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,115,950 (Rohr).
- 7. Rohr in figures 1-19 discloses a self closing valve 70 for dispensing a pasty product such as shampoo (col. 1, lines 15-30), the valve 70 having a flexible diaphragm with two slits 92, 94 (col. 4, lines 45-60) that is in a convex shape (see figure 4) with a holding ring 88 that has a "U" shape with two holding legs of different lengths along its periphery (see figure 4), the longer leg being the one that is farther away from the container's product (see figure 16) the diaphragm held in place by protrusions 160E, the holding ring 88 having a swing latch 120 for the valve 70. The Rohr device is inherently capable of being produced by a two-component injection molding.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3754

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 10. Claims 46-47, 49-51 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohr.
- 11. Rohr explicitly has all of the elements of claims 46-47, 49-51 and 59 except for the diaphragm being made of silicone, TPE, or a multilayer plastic sheet material, or that the valve has a radius of curvature that is 0.8 to 1.4 times the chord height of the spherical segment shell of the edge-secured valve diaphragm. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize any of the above materials as they are the result of routine experimentation. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select a particular shape for the diaphragm based upon routine experimentation to arrive at the optimal value or range of specific dimensions.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW P. BAINBRIDGE whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 3754

(571)270-3767. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday, 9:30

AM to 8:30 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 571-272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. P. B./ Examiner, Art Unit 3754

/Frederick C. Nicolas/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3754